



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/314,644	05/19/1999	PAUL WESCHLER		5490

25235 7590 12/19/2002

HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEENTH ST
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/314,644

Applicant(s)

WESCHLER, PAUL

Examiner

Charles E Anya

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-12,14-22,24-28 and 30-41 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-12,24-28 and 30-41 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 37 recites the limitation "the service modules" in line 22 – 23 . There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The Examiner will take "the service modules" to mean "the plug-in service modules".

3. Claim 38 recites the limitation "the engine" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The Examiner will take "the engine" to mean "the core profile engine".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 37, 39 – 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,026,404 to Adunuthula et al.

As to claim 37, Adunuthula teaches a Core Profile Engine (Dispatcher 214 Col. 6 Ln. 40 – 61, Col. 7 Ln. 55 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 37, Col. 15 Ln. 23 – 52), Gateway or Firewall Servers (Web Server 280, Listener Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 36), Client Applications (Browsers 202, 204, 206 Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 36), Plug-in Service modules (Cartridges 230,

234, 238 Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 36), a Distributed Computing Environment (System 200 Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 36), an Application Programming Interface (Transport Adapters 212, 214, 218 Col. 15 Ln. 55 – 67, Col. 16 Ln. 1 – 10), a Request (“...browser request...” Col. 16 Ln. 1 – 10), a Service (“...replies...” Col. 16 Ln. 1 – 10), a Pluggable Interface Cartridge (Col. 7 Ln. 9 – 34, Execution Engines Col. 14 Ln. 18 – 67 Col. 15 Ln. 1 – 52, Col. 17 Ln. 24 – 43), an Initialization Parameter (Col. 17, Ln. 24 – 43), a Service Connector (Dispatcher 214 Col. 6 Ln. 40 – 61, Col. 7 Ln. 55 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 37, Col. 15 Ln. 23 – 52) a Reference (“...handler...” Col. 15 Ln. 23 – 52).

Although Adunuthula is silent with regards to a storage location, it will be obvious that the initialization parameter will include a storage location since it provides the address of system resources.

As to claim 39, Adunuthula teaches an Application (Application Server 280 Col. 8 Ln. 40 – 67, Col. 9 Ln. 1 – 9), a Configuration file (Configuration Provider 256 Col. 9 Ln. 1 – 9), an Indicator (Resource Manager 254 Col. 9 Ln. 1 – 9), a Service Connector (Dispatchers 214, 220, 226 Col. 7 Ln. 55 – 67, Col. 9 Ln. 45 – 67, Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 11), requesting access to the service (Col. 9 Ln. 65 – 67), lookup for an instance of the service (Col. 9 Ln. 65 – 67, Col. 11 Ln. 45 – 67 Col. 12 Ln. 1 – 32), obtaining a reference to the instance (Col. 12 Ln. 1 – 32) and returning the reference to the instance (Col. 12 Ln. 1 – 32). Although Adunuthula does not explicitly teach an instantiated service connector/dispatcher is obvious that the dispatcher will be instantiated at time of dynamic loading (Col. 7 Ln. 55 – 65).

As to claim 40, Adunuthula teaches an identification of a version of service (Col. 8 Ln. 24 – 33).

As to claim 41, Adunuthula teaches the step of operating the application to request identification of an interface implemented by the referenced service (Col. 7 Ln. 9 – 34) and operating the service connector to retrieve and return the interface identification to the application (Col. 12 Ln. 1 – 32).

6. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,026,404 to Adunuthula et al. in view of Braddy.

As to claim 38, Adunuthula teaches an Authorization Plug-in (Col. 7 Ln. 9 – 34), Authentication Plug-in (Col. 7 Ln. 9 – 34, Col. 8 Ln. 4 – 37).

Although Adunuthula is silent with reference to a notification plug-in, log plug-in, group plug-in, an entity identification plug-in and replication plug-in.

Braddy teaches a notification plug-in (Col. 12, Ln. 35 – 53) and log plug-in (Col. 13, Ln. 37 – 49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention to include the teaching of Braddy to the system of Adunuthula. One would have been motivated to make such modifications in order to provide configuration changes, and enable or disable the request broker and record error messages (Col. 12, Ln. 35 – 53, Col. 13, Ln. 37 – 49).

Although neither Adunuthula nor Braddy teaches group plug-in, an entity identification plug-in and replication plug-in these limitations will inherently be implemented since this system is a database.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 – 12, 14 – 22, 25 – 28 and 30 – 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,360,230 to Chan et al.

As to claim 1, Chan teaches a Second Service (Client, Application, figure 3B, Client1 406, Client2 407), a First Service (Namespace, figure 3B, DS1 409, DS2 412, DS 415), a Computer System (Computer System 400), a Service Connector Interface (“OleDs provides an interface...”, Col. 6, Ln. 37 – 47, IoleDsContainer Interface), subsequently invoking the service connector interface in conjunction with the second service (The binding function then invokes...”, Col. 7, Ln. 10 – 13, OleDsGetObject Function), instantiating the service connector at the second service (“...an OleDs container object is instantiated...”, Col. 14 – 25) and gaining reference to the first service by second service (Binding Function, Col. 6, Ln. 66 – 67, Col. 7, 1 – 13, OleDsGetObject Function).

Although Chan does not teach instantiating the service connector interface at the second service, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the instantiation at the second service, especially in remote systems.

As to claim 2, Chan teaches a Computer Program Module (“OleDs...”, Col. 6, Ln. 37 – 39).

As to claim 4, Chan teaches retrieving a service instance (“The binding function...”, Col. 7, Ln. 5 – 10), obtaining a service reference (“...returns a pointer...”, Col. 7, Ln. 1 – 3, OleDsGetObject Function, Col. 9, Ln. 22 – 26) and returning the service reference obtained (“...returns a pointer...”, Col. 7, Ln. 1 – 3, OleDsGetObject Function, Col. 9, Ln. 22 – 26).

As to claim 5, Chan teaches the step of specifying a particular version (“...a namespace is not specified...”, Col. 7, Ln. 59 – 64).

As to claim 7, Chan teaches identifying a particular instance (WinNTDS, Col. 9, Ln. 28 – 29).

As to claim 8, see the rejection of claim 6.

As to claim 9, Chan teaches the steps of subsequently invoking the service connector interface and gaining reference to the first service that are carried out by an application program (The Binding Function, Col. 7, 1 – 25, OleDsGetObject Function, Col. 9, Ln. 14 – 48).

As to claim 10, see the rejection of claims 1 and 4.

As to claim 11, see the rejection of claim 2.

As to claim 12, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 5.

As to claim 15, see the rejection of claim 6.

As to claim 16, see the rejection of claim 7.

As to claim 17, see the rejection of claim 8.

As to claim 18, see the rejection of claim 9.

As to claim 19, see the rejection of claims 1 and 5.

As to claim 20, see the rejection of claim 2.

As to claim 21, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to claim 22, see the rejection of claim 4.

As to claim 25, see the rejection of claim 7.

As to claim 26, see the rejection of claim 8.

As to claim 27, see the rejection of claim 9.

As to claim 28, see the rejection of claims 1 and 2.

As to claim 30, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to claim 31, see the rejection of claim 4.

As to claim 32, see the rejection of claim 5.

As to claim 33, see the rejection of claim 6.

As to claim 34, see the rejection of claim 7.

As to claim 35, see the rejection of claim 8.

As to claim 36, see the rejection of claim 9.

8. Claims 6 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,360,230 B1 to Chan et. al. in view of Lundin et. al.

As to claim 6, claim 5 meets claim 6 except for a latest version.

Lundin teaches a Latest Version (New Software Unit 104, Col. 12, Ln. 13 – 27). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Lundin to the system of Chan. One would have been motivated to make such a modification to provide a process at run-time that can be linked by linked procedure call (Col. 12, Ln. 13 – 15).

As to claim 24, see the rejection of claim 6.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 2, 4 – 12, 14 – 22, 24 – 28 and 30 – 41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's argument that the Examiner's reference (Chan et al.) is directed to providing directory, meta-directory services and does not provide automatic discovery of identity and interface parameters for network service and as a result does not meet the limitations of the claims. The limitations of claims 1 – 2, 4 – 12, 14 – 22, 24 – 36 does not exclude providing directory, meta-directory services and as a result is not considered and Chan reference includes providing automatic/dynamic discovery of identity and interface parameters for network services (Col. 7, Ln. 1 – 9).

As to the issue of Examiner's reference (Chan et al) not retrieving an instance, the Applicant is right that Chan uses namespace identifier to retrieve code and Chan also uses the binding function to invoke the retrieved code, thereafter the invoked code uses the API set to access the identified object (Col. 7 Ln. 10 – 13), the identified object being the instance.

As to the issue of specifying a particular version, by defining a default namespace Chan clearly teaches the limitation of specifying a particular version.

The limitation of developing a program module is met by the Chan reference because it maintains a namespace container that provides the service interfaces (Col. 6, Ln. 35 – 40).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M – F (First Friday Off) from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


ALVIN OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2126